UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/659,416	09/11/2000	Arto Astala	042933/281559	4624
826 ALSTON & BI	7590 09/18/200 RD LLP	EXAMINER		
	ERICA PLAZA	NGUYEN, PHUOC H		
	RYON STREET, SUIT NC 28280-4000	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2143	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/659,416	ASTALA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
PHUOC H. NGUYEN	2143	

	PHUOC H. NGUYEN	2143	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 August 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF		-	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelication (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the content of the con	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ').	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date whave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS		20 ( ) ( 1 )	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);	
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li></ul>	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying ti	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a control NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u> .		I be entered and an e.	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>47-50 and 66-75</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>None</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12.  ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ( 13.  ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Phuoc H Nguyen/ Examiner, Art Unit 2143		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues in pages 2-5 for claims 47, 70, 72 and 74 that the cited reference fails to address the limitations of receiving a configuration upgrade message from a source of a software upgrade wherein the source must be from a software upgrade instead of any type of source as used in the cited reference. The examiner respectfully submits that the software image builder can be considered as source of software upgrade since the claim does not specific any structure or type of the source of software upgrade. Thus, any source has either directly or indirectly related to software upgrade would meet the claimed invention. Building image for the system could be either responded to the new system with fresh image or updated image wherein the updated image would include the software upgrade. In addition, the claim does not define the software upgrade is partial upgrade or complete upgrade. Thus, as long as the source relates to software upgrade with any means would meet the claimed invention.

The applicant also argues in pages 3-4 for claims 49, 71, 73 and 75 that the cited reference by Kroening fails to teach or suggest that the message is received from a service provider capable of providing an end service product.

The examiner respectfully submits that the claims fail to clearly address what is the end service product. The examiner broadly interprets the end service product as the result of any service. Thus, the examiner interprets the above limitations as a request message in the server from a service provide for a service wherein the service as the end service product can be anything. With the broadly but reasonably interpretation within scope of specification, the cited reference by Kroening clearly discloses or suggests the above limitations in Figure 1 wherein the BOM as the service provider sends the request of upgrade to the server 20-30 for performing a service which is building an upgrade image for the system..